

Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 192487

15

ORIGIN NEA-10

INFO OCT-01 AF-06 ISO-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 PM-04 H-02 INR-07

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-05 PA-01 PRS-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06

SAB-01 AID-05 OMB-01 TRSE-00 EB-07 COME-00 /077 R

DRAFTED BY NEA/P: RONEILL:RGH

APPROVED BY NEA/P: GFSHERMAN

S/PRS - MR. FUNSETH (INFO)

H - MR. FLATEN (INFO)

NEA/IAI - MR. SMITH (INFO)

NEA/EGY - MR. MATTHEWS (INFO)

NEA/ARN - MR. DAY (INFO)

----- 059967

R 140026Z AUG 75

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO AMEMBASSY ALGIERS

AMEMBASSY AMMAN

AMEMBASSY BEIRUT

AMEMBASSY CAIRO

AMEMBASSY DAMASCUS

AMEMBASSY JIDDA

AMEMBASSY KUWAIT

AMCONSUL DHAHRAN

AMCONSUL JERUSALEM

AMEMBASSY KHARTOUM

AMEMBASSY MANAMA

AMEMBASSY TEHRAN

AMEMBASSY TEL AVIV

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE STATE 192487

E.O. 11652: N/A

TAGS: PFOR

SUBJECT: DEPARTMENT PRESS BRIEFING

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 02 STATE 192487

FOR YOUR INFORMATION AND GUIDANCE FOLLOWING ARE EXCERPTS
FROM DEPARTMENT SPOKESMAN'S PRESS BRIEFING FOR AUGUST 13,
1975:

ANNOUNCEMENT: THE SECRETARY TOLD ME THIS MORNING THAT HE WILL BE LEAVING WASHINGTON FRIDAY AFTERNOON FOR VAIL TO MEET WITH THE PRESIDENT.

Q. WHY IS THAT MEETING NECESSARY, BOB?

A. I THINK HE WANTS TO MEET WITH THE PRESIDENT AND HAVE SOME PERSONAL CONSULTATIONS WITH HIM OVER THE WEEKEND.

Q. WOULD IT BE WRONG TO SURMIZE THAT THE REASON FOR THE TRIP IS SO THAT THE PRESIDENT CAN ANNOUNCE THAT THE SECRETARY WILL BE GOING TO THE MIDDLE EAST NEXT WEEK?

A. THERE ARE ALL SORTS OF THINGS YOU CAN SURMIZE. OBVIOUSLY THE MIDDLE EAST IS SOMETHING THAT IS VERY HIGH ON THE AGENDA. THE SECRETARY WILL BE RETURNING TO WASHINGTON ON MONDAY.

THE GROUP THAT MET YESTERDAY -- MR. GAZIT AND DR. ROSENNE -- WAS SCHEDULED TO MEET AT TEN O'CLOCK, BUT BOTH SIDES AGREED THEY NEEDED MORE TIME TO PREPARE FOR THIS SECOND MEETING, SO IT HAS BEEN RESCHEDULED FOR 2:45 THIS AFTERNOON, IN MR. SISCO'S OFFICE.

Q. WHAT NECESSITATED THE DELAY?

A. THEY JUST DECIDED THEY NEEDED MORE TIME TO PREPARE FOR IT.

Q. COULD WE SAY THAT THIS WAS DUE TO THE RECEIPT OF THE EGYPTIAN RESPONSE?

A. I CANNOT SAY WHAT IT IS DUE TO. I SPOKE WITH MR. SISCO THIS MORNING, AND HE AND AMBASSADOR DINITZ BOTH DECIDED THEY NEEDED MORE TIME OR WANTED MORE TIME TO LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 03 STATE 192487

PREPARE FOR THE MEETING. YOU KNOW, THEY BOTH CAME IN AND THEY OPENED THE 9:30 MEETING. SO I DO NOT THINK IT IS ANY BIG DEAL.

UNDER SECRETARY SISCO AND AMBASSADOR DINITZ DECIDED THEY BOTH NEEDED A LITTLE MORE TIME TO PREPARE FOR THEIR SECOND MEETING, AND SO THAT HAS BEEN RESCHEDULED FOR 2:45.

Q. HOW ABOUT THE MORNING MEETING BETWEEN THE EXPERTS, FINANCIAL EXPERTS? IS THERE ANYTHING TO REPORT?

A. NOT AT THIS POINT. THEY ADJOURNED FOR LUNCH AND THEY ARE RETURNING AND WILL MEET IMMEDIATELY AFTER LUNCH.

Q. WAS IT SCHEDULED -- A MORNING AND AFTERNOON SESSION?

A. I DO NOT KNOW THAT IT WAS SPECIFICALLY SCHEDULED FOR THE AFTERNOON, EXCEPT THAT IT WAS CONTEMPLATED THAT THESE MEETINGS WOULD GO ON FOR SEVERAL DAYS.

Q. WILL THE SECRETARY BE PARTICIPATING IN ANY OF THE MEETINGS TODAY?

A. NOT TO MY KNOWLEDGE, NO. HE IS NOT PLANNING TO.

Q. BOB, WILL SISCO BE ATTENDING THE ECONOMIC MEETINGS?

A. THE OPENING OF THE ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL TALKS WAS ATTENDED BY UNDER SECRETARY SISCO AND AMBASSADOR DINITZ, AND I BELIEVE THEY LEFT AFTER A HALF-HOUR. I DO NOT KNOW THAT THEY ARE PLANNING TO RETURN AND ACTIVELY PARTICIPATE

IN PERSON IN THESE MEETINGS. IT IS PRIMARILY A MEETING OF FINANCIAL EXPERTS FROM THE TWO COUNTRIES.

Q. IN SISCO'S ABSENCE AND DINITZ'S ABSENCE, WHO IS HEADING THESE TEAMS?

A. AS I SAID YESTERDAY, THE CO-CHAIRMAN OF THE DELEGATION ON THE U.S. SIDE IS MR. NOOTER, WHO IS THE ASSISTANT AID ADMINISTRATOR FOR NEA. I BELIEVE THE HEAD OF THE ISRAELI LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 04 STATE 192487

DELEGATION IS MR. GAVNI, WHO IS DIRECTOR GENERAL OF THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE. HE IS CO-CHAIRMAN WITH AMBASSADOR DINITZ OF THE ISRAELI DELEGATION.

Q. HOW MANY AMERICANS ARE UP THERE APART FROM MR. NOOTER?

A. I REALLY DO NOT KNOW. I INDICATED YESTERDAY THAT VARIOUS AGENCIES ARE REPRESENTED. I DO NOT KNOW HOW MANY.

Q. CAN YOU GIVE THOSE AGENCIES AGAIN, BOB?

A. STATE, TREASURY, NSC AND OMB.

Q. DID THE PENTAGON TURN UP AFTER ALL?

A. NO.

Q. WHY IS THAT?

A. BECAUSE IT IS PRIMARILY A FINANCIAL MEETING, FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF AID TO ISRAEL.

Q. YOU SAY THERE ARE NO DEFENSE PEOPLE THERE, BUT THERE ARE DEFENSE PEOPLE THERE FROM ISRAEL.

A. YES. BUT I BELIEVE THAT THE OFFICIAL FROM THE ISRAELI MINISTRY OF DEFENSE, I WAS TOLD, IS THEIR CHIEF BUDGET OFFICER.

Q. BOB, HAS A DECISION BEEN MADE ON THE AMOUNT THAT ISRAEL IS GOING TO GET, AND IS THIS AN ATTEMPT TO WORK OUT HOW TO BREAK THAT DOWN, OR ARE THEY TRYING TO WORK UP TO AN AMOUNT?

A. I THINK, AS I INDICATED, THE PURPOSE OF THE MEETING WAS TO PROVIDE US WITH INFORMATION TO HELP US IN OUR ANALYSIS WITH AID LEVELS FOR FISCAL '76.

Q. BOB, WHEN YOU SPEAK OF AID, ARE WE TALKING ABOUT

CREDITS?
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 05 STATE 192487

A. WE ARE TALKING ABOUT EVERYTHING.

Q. INCLUDING GRANTS?

A. EVERYTHING -- THE TOTAL PACKAGE.

Q. DOES THIS MEETING OF FINANCIAL EXPERTS OF BOTH COUNTRIES MEAN THAT THE ADMINISTRATION HAS COMPLETED ITS REAPPRAISAL OF MIDDLE EAST POLICY?

A. NO, IT DOES NOT. IT IS CONTINUING.

Q. BOB, CAN YOU CONFIRM OR DENY THAT THE AMOUNT OF THE ISRAELI PACKAGE IS DOLS 3 BILLION?

A. I AM NOT GOING TO COMMENT ON ANY AID LEVELS.

Q. THERE IS A REPORT TO THE EFFECT THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE RECEIVED THROUGH A FOREIGN SERVICE POST, THROUGH THE STATE DEPARTMENT, A LETTER, OR A TENDER, AS IT IS TECHNICALLY KNOWN, FROM IRAQ, REGARDING SOME COMMERCIAL ARRANGEMENT, AND THE IRAQI STATEMENT SAID THAT THIS TENDER WOULD NOT INCLUDE ANY MATERIAL MANUFACTURED IN ISRAEL OR BY COMPANIES BOYCOTTED OFFICIALLY BY THE IRAQI GOVERNMENT. DO WE KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT THAT?

A. I WILL HAVE TO LOOK INTO IT.

Q. HAS THE ADMINISTRATION BEGUN CONSULTATIONS WITH CONGRESS REGARDING THE U.S. PRESENCE AT THE EARLY

WARNING RADAR STATIONS? AND THE SECOND PART OF THE QUESTION IS, HAVE THERE BEEN ANY CONGRESSIONAL REACTION OR COMPLAINTS ABOUT THIS IDEA TO DATE?

A. I AM NOT GOING TO ADDRESS SPECIFIC POINTS OF A POSSIBLE INTERIM AGREEMENT THAT IS BEING DISCUSSED. BUT IN TERMS OF THE OVERALL AGREEMENT THAT IS BEING CONSIDERED, WE ARE IN CONSTANT TOUCH WITH THE CONGRESS, OF COURSE. ON THE CURRENT TALKS, WE HAVE HAD SOME PRELIMINARY DISCUSSIONS WITH MEMBERS OF CONGRESS. I
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 06 STATE 192487

UNDERSTAND THAT THE WHITE HOUSE WILL BE HAVING FURTHER CONSULTATIONS THIS WEEK. MOREOVER, THE SECRETARY HAS BEEN IN TOUCH WITH SENATOR SPARKMAN, THE CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE AND OTHER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.

ON THE CONSIDERATION OF THE ASSIGNMENT OF AMERICAN TECHNICIANS, I THINK WE HAVE SAID IN THE PAST, AND THAT REMAINS ACCURATE TODAY, THAT IF IT SHOULD COME TO THE POINT THAT THE PARTIES, THAT IS TO SAY EGYPT AND ISRAEL, ASK US TO SEND AMERICAN TECHNICIANS TO THE AREA, WE WILL CERTAINLY SUBMIT THE PROPOSAL TO THE CONGRESS FOR THEIR VIEW BEFORE WE TAKE ANY ACTION.

Q. BEFORE OR AFTER?

A. BEFORE WHAT? BEFORE DECIDING?

Q. YES.

A. DEFINITELY BEFORE.

Q. WELL, IN THAT CASE WE CAN ASSUME THAT THIS ISSUE HAS EITHER NOT BEEN RAISED OR HAS NOT BEEN RESOLVED YET IN THE CURRENT ROUND OF DISCUSSIONS.

A. IT HAS NOT REACHED THE POINT THAT WE WOULD GO TO THE CONGRESS, THAT IS CORRECT.

Q. WELL, I MEAN, IF I FOLLOW YOU CORRECTLY NEITHER SIDE HAS YET REQUESTED AMERICAN TECHNICIANS. IS THAT CORRECT?

A. THAT IS CORRECT. THAT IS MY UNDERSTANDING.

Q. IN THE PRELIMINARY DISCUSSIONS ON THIS WHOLE IDEA, IS IT YOUR UNDERSTANDING THAT WE ARE DISCUSSING A FEW, TENS, LET'S SAY, OF U.S. PERSONNEL, OR HUNDREDS OF U.S. TECHNICIANS?

A. I DO NOT KNOW HOW THIS POINT IS BEING EXAMINED OR
WHETHER IT IS SOMETHING THAT IS AT THE TOP OF THE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 07 STATE 192487

AGENDA. I THINK IT HAS OBVIOUSLY BEEN CONSIDERED AND
PEOPLE HAVE TALKED ABOUT IT. BUT THE DETAILS OF
IT, I AM REALLY NOT ABLE TO PROVIDE YOU.

Q. WHAT IS THE REASON FOR HAVING TO CONSULT CONGRESS?
WHAT REQUIRES YOU TO CONSULT WITH CONGRESS?

A. I THINK WE BELIEVE IT IS AN ISSUE OF SUFFICIENT
IMPORTANCE THAT WE WOULD WANT TO HAVE THE BENEFIT OF
THE VIEWS OF THE CONGRESS.

Q. SUPPOSE THESE WERE CIVILIAN TECHNICIANS HIRED UNDER
CONTRACT. IS THERE ANY REASON FOR YOU TO GO TO CONGRESS
FOR THAT?

A. THERE IS NO CONSIDERATION BEING GIVEN TO THE ASSIGN-
MENT OF MILITARY PERSONNEL IN ANY EVENT. IT DEFINITELY
WILL BE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL.

Q. THAT'S NEW.

A. I DON'T THINK IT IS NEW. I THINK WE HAVE SAID
THAT IN THE PAST.

Q. SISCO SAID MILITARY OR CIVILIAN.

Q. THE SECRETARY SAID NO MILITARY.

Q. DIDN'T HEAR THE QUESTION.

A. I BELIEVE THE SECRETARY HAS SAID IN PUBLIC THAT IT
WOULD NOT BE MILITARY PERSONNEL. THERE IS NO CONSIDERA-
TION GIVEN TO THE ASSIGNMENT OF U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

Q. I HAVE A FOLLOW-UP TO MY QUESTION. IF THERE ARE
CIVILIANS AND THESE PEOPLE ARE HIRED ON CONTRACT, WHAT
IS THE REASON FOR GOING TO CONGRESS?

A. MY ANSWER STILL STANDS. WE CONSIDER THIS KIND OF
A MOVE OF SUFFICIENT IMPORTANCE THAT WE WOULD WANT THE
BENEFIT OF THE VIEWS OF THE CONGRESS.
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 08 STATE 192487

Q. I DON'T KNOW WHETHER THE TWO ARE COMPARABLE, FIRST.

AND SECOND, I DON'T KNOW THE ANSWER TO YOUR QUESTION.

Q. IT SEEMS TO ME THE TWO ARE QUITE ANALOGOUS.

A. I REALLY DO NOT. ONE IS A QUESTION OF SENDING TECHNICIANS TO PROVIDE TECHNICAL ADVICE, AND THE ONE THAT MAY BE CONSIDERED OR IS UNDER CONSIDERATION IS TO HAVE SOME ROLE ON PATROLLING OR MAINTAINING OR PROVIDING SURVEILLANCE ON THE GROUND. I THINK THAT IS A BIG DIFFERENCE.

Q. IS THERE IN FACT CONSIDERATION BEING GIVEN TO U.S. PATROLLING OF A BUFFER ZONE?

A. NOL BUT IT IS A QUESTION OF THE USE OF AMERICAN TECHNICIANS. AND I THINK THAT IS QUITE DIFFERENT.

Q. I MEAN THE WORD "PATROLLING" WAS YOURS. I NEVER HEARD THAT RAISED BEFORE.

A. I WILL STRIKE THAT WORD FROM THE RECORD.

Q. WHEN YOU ANSWERED TED'S QUESTION BEFORE--HE SAID NEITHER SIDE HAS YET REQUESTED AMERICAN TECHNICIANS, AND YOU SAID THAT IS CORRECT. BY THAT YOU MEAN THERE HAS NOT BEEN A REQUEST ALONG THOSE LINES OR IT HAS NOT YET BEEN FORMALLY EMBODIED? CERTAINLY THERE HAVE BEEN DISCUSSIONS ABOUT THAT.

A. YES, THERE HAVE BEEN DISCUSSIONS.

Q. SO THAT THE ANSWER THAT THERE HAS BEEN NO REQUEST IS NOT ABSOLUTELY SO, IS THAT RIGHT? IN OTHER WORDS, THERE HAVE BEEN REQUESTS BUT NOT FORMALLY EMBODIED.

A. I AM MAKING A DISTINCTION BETWEEN A REQUEST AND A DISCUSSION. I THINK ON BACKGROUND I SHOULD SAY ON THIS WHOLE SUBJECT, I REALLY DO NOT BELIEVE IT IS HELPFUL FOR LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 09 STATE 192487

ME TO GET INTO TOO MUCH DETAIL. IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT THIS KIND OF A REQUEST WOULD BE EMBODIED IN AN OVER-ALL INTERIM AGREEMENT.

Q. SAY THAT AGAIN, BOB.

A. ON BACKGROUND, THAT THIS KIND OF REQUEST, IF IT DOES COME, PRESUMABLY WOULD BE PART OF AN OVERALL INTERIM AGREEMENT. THAT IS ON BACKGROUND.

Q. BOB, WHAT IS AN OVERALL INTERIM AGREEMENT AS COMPARED WITH AN INTERIM AGREEMENT?

A. IT'S THE SAME.

Q. BOB, WHAT YOU ARE SAYING, THEN, IS YOU ARE GOING TO PRESENT CONGRESS WITH A COMPLETE PACKAGE AND SAY "WELL, WE WANT YOUR VIEWS ON ONE SMALL PART OF THIS -- ACCEPT IT OR TURN IT DOWN." IS THAT CORRECT?

A. NO, I DO NOT THINK THAT IS CORRECT. I HAVE INDICATED IN RESPONSE TO EARLIER QUESTIONS THAT WE HAVE BEEN PRESENTLY IN TOUCH WITH THE CONGRESS ON THE INTERIM AGREEMENT ITSELF, AND THE WHITE HOUSE WILL BE CONTINUING THESE CONSULTATIONS IN A GENERAL SENSE. THE SECRETARY HAS BEEN IN TOUCH WITH THE CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE FOREIGN

RELATIONS COMMITTEE. AND THEN, AS THE SECRETARY HAS INDICATED PREVIOUSLY ON THE SPECIFIC POINT, IF AND WHEN THE PARTIES CONCERNED SHOULD REQUEST AMERICAN TECHNICIANS TO BE PRESENT IN THE AREA, WE WOULD GO TO THE CONGRESS ON THAT SPECIFIC POINT.

Q. I THINK LARS' QUESTION REALLY GOES TO THE CHRONOLOGY OF HOW THIS THING WILL WORK. IT IS AN ISSUE THAT IS NOW BEING DISCUSSED. IT IS AN ISSUE THAT HAS NOT YET BEEN RAISED FORMALLY WITH CONGRESS. CONGRESS IS ALREADY BEGINNING TO DISPLAY SOME CONCERN OVER THIS ISSUE. IF IT IS NOT RAISED UNTIL SUCH TIME AS AN AGREEMENT IS ON THE VERGE OF BEING SIGNED, THEN PRESUMABLY CONGRESS WOULD BE GIVEN MORE OR LESS OF A FAIT ACCOMPLI.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 10 STATE 192487

A. THERE IS NO INTENT OF ANY FAIT ACCOMPLI WITH THE CONGRESS.

Q. WELL, THEN, WHY ISN'T THIS ISSUE BEING RAISED WITH CONGRESS NOW?

A. BECAUSE, AS I SAID, WE ARE NOT AT A POINT WHERE BOTH SIDES HAVE ASKED US TO HAVE AMERICAN TECHNICIANS PRESENT IN THE AREA.

Q. BUT YOU ARE AT A POINT AT WHICH THIS ISSUE IS BEING DISCUSSED. AND THEREFORE IT IS REASONABLE TO ASSUME THAT THIS MAY BE A PART OF A FINAL AGREEMENT. WOULDN'T IT BEHOVE THE STATE DEPARTMENT - -

A. I THINK WE ARE TRYING TO ESTABLISH A VERY FINE MINUTE BY MINUTE, HOUR BY HOUR CHRONOLOGY. AND THAT REALLY IS NOT VERY PRACTICAL OR FEASIBLE IN THIS KIND OF DISCUSSION OR

ATMOSPHERE THAT WE ARE DEALING IN. WE ARE IN TOUCH WITH THE CONGRESS. WE WILL BE IN FURTHER TOUCH WITH THE CONGRESS. AND WE ARE KEEPING THEM FULLY INFORMED.

Q. MY POINT IS UNLESS ALL STORIES THAT ARE BEING WRITTEN THESE DAYS ARE TOTALLY INCORRECT, WITHIN THE NEXT COUPLE OF WEEKS THERE IS A VERY GOOD CHANCE THAT THIS AGREEMENT WILL COME INTO ITS FINAL STAGE. AND UNLESS YOU ARE GOING TO WAIT UNTIL THE LAST MINUTE TO RAISE THIS PARTICULAR ISSU WITH CONGRESS, CONGRESS ISN'T GOING TO HAVE MUCH OF A SAY IN IT.

A. YES. BUT I DO NOT THINK THERE IS ANYTHING TO SUGGEST THAT WE ARE GOING TO WAIT UNTIL THE FINAL STAGES OR, TO USE YOUR WORDS, PRESENT THEM WITH A FAIT ACCOMPLI. WE ARE ALREADY IN TOUCH WITH THEM.

Q. BUT NOT ON THIS ISSUE.

Q. U.S. OFFICIALS HAVE SAID THIS REQUEST WILL BE MADE AS PART OF AN OVERALL AGREEMENT. THE POINT IS YOU ARE GOING TO GIVE CONGRESS A BACKAGE.
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 11 STATE 192487

A. I SAID THAT ON BACKGROUND.

Q. I DIDN'T SAY YOU SAID IT. I SAID U.S. OFFICIALS SAID IT. U.S. OFFICIALS SAID THIS PROPOSAL WOULD NOT BE MADE UNTIL THE FINAL PACKAGE IS READY. YOU ARE GOING TO GO TO CONGRESS WITH A FINAL MIDDLE EAST PACKAGE AND SAY QTE HERE IT IS -- VOTE IT UP OR DOWN. UNQTE.

A. WHY DON'T YOU JUST LOOK BACK IN THE RECORD TO SEE WHAT THE SECRETARY OF STATE HAS SAID ON THE RECORD ON THIS ISSUE. WE ARE GOING TO CONSULT. NO MATTER WHICH WAY YOU ASK IT, IT STILL REMAINS THE SAME. HE SAID THIS IN THE PAST AND THAT IS WHAT WE INTEND TO DO. AND WE ARE IN CONTACT WITH THEM.

Q. HOW ARE YOU GOING TO DO IT WHEN CONGRESS IS NOT IN SESSION AND WON'T RETURN UNTIL NEXT MONTH?

A. WE WILL JUST HAVE TO COMMUNICATE WITH THE LEADERSHIP AND WITH OTHER PEOPLE DIRECTLY WHEREVER THEY MAY BE.

Q. YOU SAID YOU HAD BEEN IN TOUCH WITH CONGRESS ON THIS INTERIM AGREEMENT, BUT NOT ON THIS ISSUE. THERE HAVE BEEN NO DISCUSSIONS OF EVEN AN INFORMAL NATURE?

A. I COULD NOT REALLY SAY THAT. I CANNOT RULE THAT OUT.

Q. YOU DID SAY BEFORE NOT ON THIS ISSUE. I JUST WANT TO GET THAT CLEAR.

A. AS FAR AS I KNOW -- I WILL JUST SAY OVER AGAIN WHAT I HAVE SAID: THAT IF AND WHEN THE TWO PARTIES ASK US, BOTH OF THEM, EGYPT AND ISRAEL, AT THAT POINT WE WILL GET IN TOUCH WITH THE CONGRESS.

Q. WOULD THE ADMINISTRATION RECOMMEND THIS, IN CASE OF SUCH A MUTUAL REQUEST?

A. I DON'T THINK I SHOULD GET INTO THE QUALITATIVE MANNER IN WHICH WE PRESENT THIS. WE ARE OBVIOUSLY DISCUSSING LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 12 STATE 192487

IT WITH THE CONGRESS WITH THE IDEA OF IS THIS THE BEST WAY TO ACHIEVE PEACE, AND WE ARE INTERESTED IN THEIR VIEWS.

Q. YOU MENTIONED THE CONGRESS SEVERAL TIMES. AND YOU MENTIONED ONE NAME -- SENATOR SPARKMAN. CAN YOU GIVE US ANY OTHER NAMES?

A. NO -- I JUST MENTIONED HIS. I SAID THAT THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE PRESENT TALKS HAD BEEN IN TOUCH WITH THE CHAIRMAN, AND HE HAS BEEN IN TOUCH WITH OTHERS. I DON'T HAVE THE NAMES OF THE OTHERS.

A. THERE WERE REPORTS THAT SENATOR JACKSON HAS SOME RESERVATIONS ABOUT THE USING OF AMERICAN TECHNICIANS IN THE INTERIM AGREEMENT. DO YOU HAVE SOMETHING ON THAT?

A. IN THE PROCESS OF OUR CONSULTATIONS, THAT IS THE PURPOSE OF OUR CONSULTATIONS -- TO HAVE THE VIEWS OF SENATOR JACKSON AND OTHER INTERESTED MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS.

Q. IS THAT THE PURPOSE OF TALKING WITH THE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, JUST TO GET THEIR VIEWS, AND THEN DO WHAT THE DEPARTMENT FEELS IT OUGHT TO DO ANYWAY; SEEKING APPROVAL, AND IF APPROVAL IS NOT FORTHCOMING, THEN WHAT?

A. IF THE CONGRESS WOULD REJECT THE EFFORTS WE ARE MAKING TO ACHIEVE PEACE IN THE AREA -- AND WHAT FORM THIS REJECTION WOULD TAKE I DO NOT KNOW -- WE WOULD VIEW THAT OBVIOUSLY AS A VERY SERIOUS ACTION. WE DO NOT EXPECT THAT. WE HAVE NO REASON TO BELIEVE THAT THEY ARE LIKELY TO TAKE THAT POSITION AS A RESULT OF THE TALKS WE HAVE ALREADY HAD.

Q. WELL, IS IT LIKE TAKING A POLL OF SELECTED MEMBERS WITH RESPONSIBILITY IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS, OR IS IT JUST KEEPING CONGRESS FILLED IN?

A. NO. WE ARE SOLICITING THEIR VIEWS AND WE ARE TAKING
THEM INTO ACCOUNT.

Q. WHEN YOU SAY YOU ARE GOING TO SUBMIT A PROPOSAL, IS
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 13 STATE 192487

THAT GOING TO REQUIRE A VOTE BY CONGRESS?

A. I DO NOT THINK IT DOES. IT IS A FORM OF CONSULTA-
TION WITH THE CONGRESS. I WOULD NOT KNOW HOW THERE WOULD
BE A VOTE TAKEN.

Q. YOU SAID QTE SUBMIT A PROPOSAL UNQTE. THAT IS A
CURIOUS WAY OF SAYING IT. A PROPOSAL USUALLY REQ;IRES SOME
SORT OF APPROVAL, YES OR NO.

A. I THINK THERE ARE ALL SORTS OF PROPOSALS, IDEAS, SUG-
GESTIONS, PLANS, DISCUSSED WITH THE CONGRESS IN WHICH A
VOTE IS NOT TAKEN.

Q. YOU ARE LEAVING ME CERTAINLY WITH THE IMPRESSION THAT
IF YOU DECIDE THAT THERE BE INCLUDED AMERICAN TECHNICIANS -

A. I DID NOT SAY THAT.

Q. LET ME DEVELOP THIS.

A. ALL RIGHT.

Q. IF THE FINAL PACKAGE INCLUDES AT THE REQUEST OF THE
ISRAELIS AND THE EGYPTIANS THE INTRODUCTION OF AMERICAN
TECHNICIANS, I HAVE THE IMPRESSION FROM WHAT YOU ARE SAY-
ING NOW THAT ALTHOUGH YOU SAY YOU TALK TO CONGRESS AND
CONSULT WITH CONGRESS, YOU WILL GO AHEAD WITH IT.

A. I AM NOT SAYING THAT. I AM SAYING THAT BEFORE WE MADE
A DECISION -- AND THE SECRETARY OF STATE HAS SAID THIS,
I BELIEVE -- WE ARE GOING TO GO TO THE CONGRESS.

Q. YES. BUT THAT LEAVES OPEN THE POSSIBILITY THAT YOU
COULD IGNORE CONGRESSIONAL RESISTANCE.

A. I THINK IN MY ANSWER TO JERRY'S QUESTION, I SUGGESTED
THAT WE DO NOT ANTICIPATE A CONGRESSIONAL REJECTION OF
OUR EFFORTS TO ACHIEVE PEACE IN THE AREA. THAT OBVIOUS-
LY WOULD BE A VERY SERIOUS DEVELOPMENT.
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 14 STATE 192487

Q. BUT YOU ARE NOT AT THE SAME TIME SPECIFICALLY SAYING THAT YOU WANT CONGRESSIONAL ENDORSEMENT FOR THE INTRODUCTION OF ANY AMERICAN TECHNICIANS.

A. I THINK THAT IS SUGGESTED AND IMPLIED BY THE VERY FACT THAT YOU ARE CONSULTING WITH THEM BEFORE YOU MAKE THE DECISION.

Q. NO, IT DOESN'T BOB. WITH ALL DUE RESPECT, I THINK IT CAN ALSO BE A MATTER OF COURTESY. ARE YOU IN FACT LOOKING FOR CONGRESSIONAL ENDORSEMENT?

A. LET ME SAY THAT CERTAINLY THE PURPOSE OF OUR CONSULTATION IS NOT TO BE COURTEOUS. WE ARE ALWAYS COURTEOUS. BUT IT IS MORE THAN MANNERS INVOLVED HERE. WE ARE LOOKING AT THE SUBSTANCE OF THE ISSUE, AND WE WANT CONGRESSIONAL VIEWS.

Q. BUT YOU STILL HAVEN'T ANSWERED MY QUESTION. ARE YOU LOOKING FOR CONGRESSIONAL ENDORSEMENT?

A. LET'S LOOK AND SEE WHEN WE HAVE ON THE RECORD OF THIS BRIEFING, THE VARIOUS ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS, AND SEE IF IT IS NOT COVERED.

Q. WOULDN'T YOU RATHER HAVE IT THAN NOT HAVE IT?

A. OF COURSE.

Q. WHO WOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE SAFETY AND SECURITY OF THESE AMERICAN TECHNICIANS?

A. I DON'T THINK WE HAVE ARRIVED AT THAT POINT. I AM SURE THIS WILL BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.

Q. IS THERE ANY OTHER ISSUE THAT WE ARE CONSULTING WITH CONGRESS IN REFERENCE TO THIS PACKAGE ?

A. I INDICATED THAT WE ARE DISCUSSING. IT IS NOT AN EXCLUSIVE CONSULTATION; IT IS INCLUSIVE. BUT THIS IS LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 15 STATE 192487

VIOUSLY A SPECIAL POINT, WHEN YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT NOT JUST THE FRAMEWORK OF AN AGREEMENT OF CONDITIONS ON WHICH THE TWO PARTIES AGREE, BUT YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT AN ELEMENT OF AN AGREEMENT THAT MIGHT INCLUDE THE PRESENCE OF AMERICAN CITIZENS.

Q. WHAT IT AMOUNTS TO, I ASSUME, FROM WHAT YOU HAVE BEEN

SAYING, THAT IT IS NOT FOR THE CONGRESS TO ACCEPT OR REJECT ANY AGREEMENT, EXCEPT TO EXPRESS ITS VIEWS REGARDING ANY POSSIBLE AMERICAN PARTICIPATION.

Q. AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN ISRAEL AND EGYPT IS SURELY NOT FOR CONGRESS. IT IS THE AMERICAN PARTICIPATION THAT IS THE ISSUE. THIS IS WHAT I AM GETTING AT.

A. THAT IS OBVIOUSLY A DIFFERENT ISSUE. BUT THERE CERTAINLY IS AMERICAN PARTICIPATION, WHEN WE ARE ASSUMING THE MAJOR ROLE OF TRYING TO BRING THE TWO PARTIES TOGETHER WITH OUR OWN EFFORTS. AND FOR THAT REASON WE HAVE BEEN KEEPING THE CONGRESS IN CLOSE TOUCH. AND THERE WILL BE MORE EFFORTS BEGINNING THIS WEEK BY THE WHITE HOUSE.

Q. ARE YOU SAYING -- DID I UNDERSTAND YOU CORRECTLY THAT IN THE PRELIMINARY DISCUSSIONS, THAT THE ADMINISTRATION AND/OR THE SECRETARY HAVE HAD WITH CONGRESS, THAT THE ISSUE OF AMERICAN TECHNICIANS HAS NOT YET EVEN BEEN BROACHED

IN THE MOST PRELIMINARY WAY?

A. I AM NOT PREPARED TO SAY THAT, NO.

Q. HOW IS THE WHITE HOUSE GOING ABOUT THIS? IS THERE A PLAN TO INVITE PEOPLE TO VAIL TO DISCUSS THIS WITH THE SECRETARY THIS WEEKEND?

A. I DO NOT KNOW WHAT THE PLAN IS IN THE WHITE HOUSE.

KISSINGER

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 26 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: PRESS CONFERENCES
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 14 AUG 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: CunninFX
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975STATE192487
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: NEA/P: RONEILL:RGH
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: D750280-0939
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t197508100/baaaarza.tel
Line Count: 682
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, TEXT ON MICROFILM
Office: ORIGIN NEA
Original Classification: LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 13
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: CunninFX
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 29 JUL 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <29 JUL 2003 by KelleyW0>; APPROVED <24 NOV 2003 by CunninFX>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: <DBA CORRECTED> gwr 971010
Subject: n/a
TAGS: PFOR, SOPN, US, PFOR, SOPN
To: ALGIERS
AMMAN
BEIRUT
CAIRO
DAMASCUS
JIDDA

KUWAIT
DHAHRAN
JERUSALEM
KHARTOUM
MANAMA
TEHRAN
TEL AVIV

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006